arXiv:math/0503108v1 [math.PR] 6 Mar 2005

A RANDOM WALK PROOF OF THE ERDŐS-TAYLOR CONJECTURE

JAY ROSEN[‡]

Abstract. For the simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ we study those points which are visited an unusually large number of times, and provide a new proof of the Erdős-Taylor Conjecture describing the number of visits to the most visited point.

1. Introduction

In our paper [1] we proved a conjecture of Erdős and Taylor concerning the number L_n^* of visits to the most visited site for the simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ up to step n.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\{X_j\,;\,j\geq 1\}$ be the simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{L_n^*}{(\log n)^2}=1/\pi\quad a.s. \tag{1.1}$$

Our approach in that paper was to first prove an analogous result for planar Brownian motion and then to use strong approximation. The goal of this paper, which is purely expository, is to show how to prove (1.1) using only random walk methods. We also go beyond (1.1) and study the size of the set of 'frequent points', i.e. those points in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ which are visited an unusually large number of times, of order $(\log n)^2$. Perhaps more important than our specific results, we develop powerful estimates for the simple random walk which we expect will have wide applicability.

Let L_n^x denote the number of times that $x\in\mathbb{Z}^2$ is visited by the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ up to step n, (so that $L_n^*=\max_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^2}L_n^x$). Set

$$\Theta_n(\alpha)=\Big\{x\in\mathbb{Z}^2:\ \frac{L_n^x}{(\log n)^2}\geq\alpha/\pi\Big\}. \tag{1.2}$$

Let $D(x,r)=\{y\in\mathbb{Z}^2\,|\,|y-x|<r\}$. Let $T_B=\inf\{i\geq 0\,|\,X_i\in B\}$ for any $B\subseteq\mathbb{Z}^2$ and set

$$\Psi_n(a)=\Big\{x\in D(0,n):\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,n)^c}}}{(\log n)^2}\geq 2a/\pi\Big\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Date: March 2, 2005.

[‡] Research supported, in part, by grants from the NSF and from PSC-CUNY .

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\{X_j\,;\,j\geq 1\}$ be the simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Then for any* $0<\alpha<1$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log|\Theta_n(\alpha)|}{\log n}=1-\alpha\quad a.s. \tag{1.4}$$

Equivalently, for any $0<a<2$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log|\Psi_n(a)|}{\log n}=2-a\quad a.s. \tag{1.5}$$

The equivalence of (1.4) and (1.5) follows from the strong invariance principle which implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log T_{D(0,n)^c}}{\log n}=2\quad \text{a.s.} \tag{1.6}$$

In particular, (1.1) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{L^*_{D(0,n)^c}}{(\log n)^2}=2/\pi\quad \text{a.s.} \tag{1.7}$$

In Section 2 we prove the upper bound for Theorem 1.2, and the lower bound is proven in Section 3, subject to Lemma 3.2. Sections 4-6 are devoted to the proof of Lemma 3.2.

Here are the basic ideas behind our proof of (1.7). It is not too hard to get good estimates on $P(L^x_{T_{D(0,n)^c}}\geq(2-\epsilon)(\log n)^2/\pi)$ for $x\in D(0,n)$, and indeed this is how we obtain the upper bound for (1.7) in Section 2. On the other hand, the lower bound requires a second moment estimate, which is problematic due to the large correlation between the events $\{L^x_{T_{D(0,n)^c}}\geq(2-\epsilon)(\log n)^2/\pi\}$ for different $x\in D(0,n)$. Rather than study the events $\{L^x_{T_{D(0,n)^c}}\geq(2-\epsilon)(\log n)^2/\pi\}$, we define a point $x\in D(0,n)$ to be 'n-succesful' if, up to time $T_{D(0,n)^c}$, there is a specified number of excursions between circles centered at x. The 'excursion count' is chosen to be 'typical' for x with $\{L^x_{T_{D(0,n)^c}}\geq(2-\epsilon)(\log n)^2/\pi\}$, so that the probability of x being 'n-succesful' is close to $P(L^x_{T_{D(0,n)^c}}\geq(2-\epsilon)(\log n)^2/\pi)$ and also, for large enough n, all 'n-succesful' points x have $L^x_{T_{D(0,n)^c}}\geq(2-2\epsilon)(\log n)^2/\pi$, see Lemma 3.1. The advantage of working with 'n-succesful' points is that the correlation between two such points, x,y, can be controlled using the tree-like structure of circles centered at the two points. In particular we show that for x,y far apart, excursions between circles centered at x and close to x are almost independent of the excursions between circles centered at y and close to y.

2. Local time estimates and upper bounds

Let X_n, $n\geq 0$ denote the simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. We use P^x, E^x for the probability and expectation for the walk started at x, and write simply P, E for the walk started at the origin. For any set $A\subseteq\mathbb{Z}^2$ we define the boundary ∂A of A by $\partial A = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \,|\, y \in A^c, \text{ and } \inf_{x\in A} |y-x| \le 1\}$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ define the Green's function

$$G_A(x,y) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} P^x\left(X_i = y,\, i < T_{A^c}\right). \tag{2.1}$$

Lemma 2.1. *For $|x_0| = r < R$ and some finite constant γ,*

$$E^{x_0}(L^0_{T_{D(0,R)^c}}) = G_{D(0,R)}(x_0,0) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\pi}\log(R) + \gamma + O(R^{-1}) & \text{if } x_0 = 0 \\ \frac{2}{\pi}\log(\frac{R}{r}) + O(r^{-1}) & \text{if } x_0 \ne 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Let $x_0 \ne 0$. For any $0 < \varphi \le 1$

$$E^{x_0}\left(e^{-\frac{\varphi}{G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)}L^0_{T_{D(0,R)^c}}}\right) = 1 - \frac{\log(\frac{R}{r})}{\log(R)}\frac{\varphi}{1+\varphi}\left(1 + O(\frac{1}{\log(r)})\right) \tag{2.3}$$

and for all $z \ge 1$

$$P^{x_0}(L^0_{T_{D(0,R)^c}} \ge zG_{D(0,R)}(0,0)) \le c\sqrt{z}e^{-z} \tag{2.4}$$

for some $c < \infty$ independent of x_0, z, R.

Proof of Lemma 2.1: By Theorem 1.6.6 of [4],

$$G_{D(0,R)}(0,0) = \frac{2}{\pi}\log R + \gamma + O(R^{-1}) \tag{2.5}$$

for an explicit constant γ, and by Proposition 1.6.7 of [4]

$$G_{D(0,R)}(x,0) = \frac{2}{\pi}\log\left(\frac{R}{|x|}\right) + O(|x|^{-1}). \tag{2.6}$$

Since

$$L^0_{T_{D(0,R)^c}} = \sum_{i<T_{D(0,R)^c}} 1_{\{X_i=0\}}, \tag{2.7}$$

(2.2) follows.

For (2.3), note that, conditional on hitting 0, $L^0_{T_{D(0,R)^c}}$ is a geometric random variable with mean $G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &E^{x_0}\left(e^{-\frac{\varphi}{G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)}L^0_{T_{D(0,R)^c}}}\right) \\ &= 1 - P^{x_0}\left(T_0 < T_{D(0,R)^c}\right) \\ &\quad + P^{x_0}\left(T_0 < T_{D(0,R)^c}\right)\left(\frac{1}{(e^{\frac{\varphi}{G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)}} - 1)G_{D(0,R)}(0,0) + 1}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Since by (2.5)

$$\frac{1}{G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)} = O(1/\log(R)) \tag{2.9}$$

we have

$$(e^{\frac{\varphi}{G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)}}-1)G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)+1=1+\varphi+O(\frac{1}{\log(R)}). \tag{2.10}$$

Furthermore, using the strong Markov property at the stopping time T_0

$$\begin{align}
G_{D(0,R)}(x_0,0) &= P^{x_0}\left(\sum_{i<T_{D(0,R)^c}} 1_{\{X_i=0\}}\right) \notag\\
&= P^{x_0}\left(\sum_{i<T_{D(0,R)^c}} 1_{\{X_i=0\}}\circ\theta_{T_0};\, T_0<T_{D(0,R)^c}\right) \tag{2.11}\\
&= P^{x_0}\left(T_0<T_{D(0,R)^c}\right)P^0\left(\sum_{i<T_{D(0,R)^c}} 1_{\{X_i=0\}}\right) \notag\\
&= P^{x_0}\left(T_0<T_{D(0,R)^c}\right)G_{D(0,R)}(0,0) \notag
\end{align}$$

so that

$$P^{x_0}\left(T_0<T_{D(0,R)^c}\right)=\frac{G_{D(0,R)}(x_0,0)}{G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)}. \tag{2.12}$$

By (2.5) and (2.6),

$$\frac{G_{D(0,R)}(x_0,0)}{G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)}=\frac{\log(\frac{R}{r})}{\log(R)}\left(1+O(\frac{1}{\log(r)})\right), \tag{2.13}$$

and (2.3) then follows.

For (2.4) note that by the strong Markov property we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E^{x_0}(L^0_{T_{D(0,R)^c}})^k &\le k!E^{x_0}\left(\sum_{0\le j_1\le\cdots\le j_k<T_{D(0,R)^c}}\prod_{i=1}^{k}1_{\{X_{j_i}=0\}}\right)\\
&\le k!E^{x_0}\left(\sum_{0\le j_1\le\cdots\le j_{k-1}<T_{D(0,R)^c}}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}1_{\{X_{j_i}=0\}}G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)\right)\\
&= k!G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)E^{x_0}\left(\sum_{0\le j_1\le\cdots\le j_{k-1}<T_{D(0,R)^c}}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}1_{\{X_{j_i}=0\}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and by iteration we obtain

$$E^{x_0}(L^0_{T_{D(0,R)^c}})^k\le k!G_{D(0,R)}(x_0,0)(G_{D(0,R)}(0,0))^{k-1}. \tag{2.14}$$

To prove (2.4), use (2.14), the fact that $G_{D(0,R)}(x_0,0)\le G_{D(0,R)}(0,0)$ by (2.11), and Chebysheff to obtain

$$P^{x_0}(L^0_{T_{D(0,R)^c}}\ge zG_{D(0,R)}(0,0))\le\frac{k!}{z^k} \tag{2.15}$$

then take $k=[z]$ and use Stirling's formula.

$\square$

We next provide the required upper bounds in Theorem 1.2. Namely, we will show that for any $a \in (0,2]$

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{\log \left|\left\{x \in D(0,m):\ L^x_{T_{D(0,m)^c}} \geq (2a/\pi)(\log m)^2\right\}\right|}{\log m} \leq 2-a \qquad a.s. \tag{2.16}$$

To see this fix $\delta > 0$ and note that by (2.4), for some $0 < \epsilon < \delta$, all $x \in D(0,m)$ and all large enough m

$$P\left(\frac{L^x_{T_{D(x,2m)^c}}}{(\log m)^2} \geq 2a/\pi\right) \leq m^{-a+\epsilon} \tag{2.17}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\left|\left\{x \in D(0,m):\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,m)^c}}}{(\log m)^2} \geq 2a/\pi\right\}\right| \geq m^{2-a+\delta}\right) \\ & \leq m^{-(2-a)-\delta} E^0\left(\left|\left\{x \in D(0,m):\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,m)^c}}}{(\log m)^2} \geq 2a/\pi\right\}\right|\right) \\ & = m^{-(2-a)-\delta} \sum_{x\in D(0,m)} P^0\left(\frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,m)^c}}}{(\log m)^2} \geq 2a/\pi\right) \\ & \leq m^{-(2-a)-\delta} \sum_{x\in D(0,m)} P^0\left(\frac{L^x_{T_{D(x,2m)^c}}}{(\log m)^2} \geq 2a/\pi\right) \\ & \leq m^{-(\delta-\epsilon)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Now apply our result to $m = m_n = e^n$ to see by Borel-Cantelli that for some $N(\omega) < \infty$ a.s. we have that for all $n \geq N(\omega)$

$$\left|\left\{x \in D(0,e^n):\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,e^n)^c}}}{(\log e^n)^2} \geq 2a/\pi\right\}\right| \leq e^{(2-a+\delta)n}. \tag{2.19}$$

Then if $e^n \leq m \leq e^{n+1}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\left\{x \in D(0,m):\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,m)^c}}}{(\log m)^2} \geq 2a/\pi\right\}\right| \\ & \leq \left|\left\{x \in D(0,e^{n+1}):\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,e^{n+1})^c}}}{(\log e^n)^2} \geq 2a/\pi\right\}\right| \\ & = \left|\left\{x \in D(0,e^{n+1}):\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,e^{n+1})^c}}}{(\log e^{n+1})^2} \geq 2a(1+1/n)^{-2}/\pi\right\}\right| \\ & \leq e^{(2-a(1+1/n)^{-2}+\delta)(n+1)} \leq m^{(2-a(1+1/n)^{-2}+\delta)(n+1)/n}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

(2.16) now follows on taking $\delta \to 0$.

$\square$

3. Lower bounds for probabilities

Fixing $0 < a < 2$, we prove in this section that

$$\liminf_{m\to\infty} \frac{\log \left|\left\{x \in D(0,m) :\ L^x_{T_{D(0,m)^c}} \geq (2a/\pi)(\log m)^2\right\}\right|}{\log m} \geq 2-a \qquad a.s. \tag{3.1}$$

In view of (2.16), we will obtain Theorem 1.2 .

Set $K_n = 16e^n n^{3n}$. Using the fact that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \log K_n/\log K_{n-1} = 1$, a simple interpolation argument shows that in order to prove (3.1) it suffices to show that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \left|\left\{x \in D(0,K_n) :\ L^x_{T_{D(0,K_n)^c}} \geq (2a/\pi)(\log K_n)^2\right\}\right|}{\log K_n} \geq 2-a \qquad a.s. \tag{3.2}$$

It suffices to prove that for any $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large n

$$P\left(\left|\left\{x \in D(0,K_n) :\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,K_n)^c}}}{(\log K_n)^2} \geq (2a/\pi)\right\}\right| \geq K_n^{2-a-\delta}\right) \geq p_\delta > 0. \tag{3.3}$$

For then

$$P\left(\left|\left\{x \in D(0,K_n) :\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,K_n)^c}}}{(\log K_{n+1})^2} \geq (2a-\delta)/\pi\right\}\right| \leq K_{n+1}^{2-a-2\delta}\right) \leq 1-p_\delta, \tag{3.4}$$

By considering the stopping times $\tau_l =: T_{D(0,lK_n)^c}$; $l = 0,1,2,\ldots,n^3-1$ and setting

$$A_l = \left\{\left|\left\{x \in D(X_{\tau_l},K_n) :\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(X_{\tau_l},K_n)^c}}}{(\log K_{n+1})^2} \geq (2a-\delta)/\pi\right\}\right| \leq K_{n+1}^{2-a-2\delta}\right\} \tag{3.5}$$

we have that

$$\left\{\left|\left\{x \in D(0,K_{n+1}) :\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,K_{n+1})^c}}}{(\log K_{n+1})^2} \geq (2a-\delta)/\pi\right\}\right| \leq K_{n+1}^{2-a-2\delta}\right\} \subseteq \cap_{l=0}^{n^3-1} A_l \circ \theta_{\tau_l}. \tag{3.6}$$

Hence using the strong Markov property and (3.4) we see that

$$P\left(\left|\left\{x \in D(0,K_{n+1}) :\ \frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,K_{n+1})^c}}}{(\log K_{n+1})^2} \geq (2a-\delta)/\pi\right\}\right| \leq K_{n+1}^{2-a-2\delta}\right) \leq (1-p_\delta)^{n^3}.$$

An application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma followed by taking the $\delta \to 0$ limit then gives (3.2).

We start by constructing a subset of the set appearing in (3.3), the probability of which is easier to bound below. To this end fix n, and let $r_{n,k} = e^n n^{3(n-k)}$, $k = 0,\ldots,n$. In particular, $r_{n,n} = e^n$ and $r_{n,0} = e^n n^{3n}$. Set $K_n = 16r_{n,0} = 16e^n n^{3n}$.

Let $U_n = [2r_{n,0}, 3r_{n,0}]^2 \subseteq D(0, K_n)$. For $x \in U_n$, let $N^x_{n,k}$ denote the number of excursions from $\partial D(x, r_{n,k-1})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,k})$ until time $T_{D(0,K_n)^c}$. Set $\mathfrak{n}_k = 3ak^2 \log k$, and $k_0 = 4 \vee \inf\{k \,|\, \mathfrak{n}_k \geq 2k\}$.

We will say that a point $x \in U_n$ is n-**successful** if $N^x_{n,k} = 1\,, \forall k = 1, \ldots, k_0 - 1$ and

$$\mathfrak{n}_k - k \leq N^x_{n,k} \leq \mathfrak{n}_k + k \qquad \forall k = k_0, \ldots, n \tag{3.7}$$

Let $Y(n,x)\,;\, x \in U_n$ be the collection of random variables defined by

$$Y(n,x) = 1 \;\text{ if } x \text{ is } n\text{-successful}$$

and $Y(n,x) = 0$ otherwise. Set $\bar{q}_{n,x} = P(Y(n,x) = 1) = E(Y(n,x))$.

The next lemma relates the notion of n-successful and local times. As usual we write $\log_2 n$ for $\log \log n$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let*

$$\mathcal{S}_n = \{x \in U_n \,|\, x \text{ is } n\text{-successful}\}.$$

Then for some $N(\omega) < \infty$ a.s., for all $n \geq N(\omega)$ and all $x \in \mathcal{S}_n$

$$\frac{L^x_{T_{D(0,K_n)^c}}}{(\log K_n)^2} \geq 2a/\pi - 2/\log_2 n.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1: Recall that if x is n-successful then $N^x_{n,n} \geq \mathfrak{n}_n - n = a(3n^2 \log n) - n$. Let $L^{x,j}$ denote the number of visits to x during the j'th excursion from $\partial D(x, r_{n,n})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,n-1})$. Then for any $0 < \lambda < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} P_x &:= P\left(L^x_{T_{D(0,K_n)^c}} \leq (2a/\pi - 2/\log_2 n)(\log K_n)^2\,,\, x \in \mathcal{S}_n\right) \\ &\leq P\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{n}_n - n} L^{x,j} \leq (2a/\pi - 1/\log_2 n)(3n \log n)^2\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\lambda(2a/\pi - 1/\log_2 n)(3n\log n)^2\right) E\left(e^{-\lambda \sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{n}_n - n} L^{x,j}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

If τ denotes the first time that the $\mathfrak{n}_n - n$'th excursion from $\partial D(x, r_{n,n-1})$ reaches $\partial D(x, r_{n,n})$ then by the strong Markov property

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left(e^{-\lambda \sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{n}_n - n} L^{x,j}}\right) \\ &= E\left(e^{-\lambda \sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{n}_n - n - 1} L^{x,j}} E^{X_\tau}\left(e^{-\lambda L^x_{T_{D(x, r_{n,n-1})^c}}}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Set $\lambda = \phi / G_{D(x, r_{n,n-1})}(x,x)$. By (2.3), with $r = r_{n,n} = e^n, R = r_{n,n-1} = n^3 e^n$, for any $0 < \phi \leq 1$ and large n

$$\sup_{y \in \partial D(x, r_{n,n})} E^y\left(e^{-\lambda L^x_{T_{D(x, r_{n,n-1})^c}}}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(1 - 1/2\log n)\,\phi}{1 + \phi} 3(\log n)/n\right). \tag{3.10}$$

Hence by induction

$$E\left(e^{-\lambda\sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{n}_n-n}L^{x,j}}\right)\le\exp\left(-\frac{(1-1/\log n)\phi}{1+\phi}9an(\log n)^2\right). \tag{3.11}$$

Then with this choice of λ, noting that $G_{D(x,r_{n,n-1})}(x,x)\sim\frac{2}{\pi}n$ by (2.5), we have

$$P_x\le\inf_{\phi>0}\exp\left(\left\{\phi(1-1/2\log_2 n)-\frac{(1-1/\log n)\phi}{1+\phi}\right\}9an(\log n)^2\right). \tag{3.12}$$

A straightforward computation shows that

$$\inf_{\varphi>0}\left(\varphi\alpha-\frac{\varphi}{1+\varphi}\beta\right)=-\left(\sqrt{\beta}-\sqrt{\alpha}\right)^2 \tag{3.13}$$

which is achieved for $\varphi=\sqrt{\beta}/\sqrt{\alpha}-1$. Using this in (3.12) we find that

$$P_x\le\exp\left(-cn(\log n/\log_2 n)^2\right). \tag{3.14}$$

Note that $|U_n|\le e^{cn\log n}$. Summing over all $x\in U_n$ and then over n and applying Borel-Cantelli will then complete the proof of Lemma 3.1.
$\square$

Using this Lemma we see that to prove (3.3) it will suffice to show that for any $\delta>0$ we can find $p_0>0$ and $N_0<\infty$ such that

$$P\left(\sum_{x\in U_n}Y(n,x)\ge K_n^{2-a-\delta}\right)\ge p_0 \tag{3.15}$$

for all $n\ge N_0$.

We will see by (3.20) of the next Lemma below that for some sequence $\delta_n\to 0$ and constant $c>0$

$$E\left(\sum_{x\in U_n}Y(n,x)\right)=\sum_{x\in U_n}\bar{q}_{n,x}\ge cK_n^{2-a-\delta_n}. \tag{3.16}$$

Recall the Paley-Zygmund inequality (see [3, page 8]): for any $W\in L^2(\Omega)$ and $0<\lambda<1$

$$P(W\ge\lambda E(W))\ge(1-\lambda)^2\frac{(E(W))^2}{E(W^2)}. \tag{3.17}$$

We will apply this with $W=W_n=\sum_{x\in U_n}Y(n,x)$. Thus to complete the proof of (3.15) it suffices to show that

$$E\left(\left\{\sum_{x\in U_n}Y(n,x)\right\}^2\right)\le c\left\{E\left(\sum_{x\in U_n}Y(n,x)\right)\right\}^2 \tag{3.18}$$

for some $c < \infty$ all n sufficiently large. Furthermore, using (3.16) it suffices to show that

$$E\left(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in U_n\\ x\neq y}} Y(n,x)Y(n,y)\right) \leq c\left\{E\left(\sum_{x\in U_n} Y(n,x)\right)\right\}^2. \tag{3.19}$$

The next lemma, which provides estimates for the first and second moments of $Y(n,x)$, will be proven in the following sections.

Lemma 3.2. *There exists $\delta_n \to 0$ such that for all $n \geq 1$,*

$$\bar{q}_{n,x} \geq Q_n = \inf_{x\in U_n} P(x \text{ is } n\text{-successful}) \geq K_n^{-(a+\delta_n)}, \tag{3.20}$$

and

$$Q_n \geq c\bar{q}_{n,x} \tag{3.21}$$

for some $c > 0$ and all n and $x \in U_n$.

There exists $C < \infty$ and $\delta_n' \to 0$ such that for all n, $x \neq y$ and $l(x,y) = \min\{m : D(x,r_{n,m}) \cap D(y,r_{n,m}) = \emptyset\} \leq n$

$$E(Y(n,x)Y(n,y)) \leq CQ_n^2(l(x,y)!)^{3a+\delta'_{l(x,y)}}. \tag{3.22}$$

In the sequel, we let C_m denote generic finite constants that are independent of n. The definition of $l(x,y) \geq 1$ implies that $|x-y| \leq 2r_{n,l(x,y)-1}$. Recall that there are at most $C_0 r_{n,l-1}^2 \leq C_0 K_n^2 l^6 (l!)^{-6}$ points y in the ball of radius $2r_{n,l-1}$ centered at x. Thus, it follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{x,y\in U_n\\ 2r_{n,n}\leq|x-y|\leq 2r_{n,0}}} E\left(Y(n,x)Y(n,y)\right) \\
&\leq C_1 \sum_{\substack{x,y\in U_n\\ 2r_{n,n}\leq|x-y|\leq 2r_{n,0}}} Q_n^2(l(x,y)!)^{3a+\delta'_{l(x,y)}} \\
&\leq C_2 Q_n^2 K_n^2 \sum_{l=1}^{n} K_n^2 l^6 (l!)^{-6}(l!)^{3a+\delta'_l} \\
&\leq C_3 (K_n^2 Q_n)^2 \sum_{l=1}^{n} l^6 (l!)^{-3(2-a)+\delta'_l} \\
&\leq C_4 (K_n^2 Q_n)^2 \leq C_5 \left\{E\left(\sum_{x\in U_n} Y(n,x)\right)\right\}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

where we used the fact from (3.20) that

$$K_n^2 Q_n \leq c\sum_{x\in U_n} \bar{q}_{n,x} = cE\left(\sum_{x\in U_n} Y(n,x)\right). \tag{3.24}$$

Similarly

$$\sum_{\substack{x,y\in U_n\\|x-y|\leq 2r_{n,n}}} E\left(Y(n,x)Y(n,y)\right)\leq \sum_{\substack{x,y\in U_n\\|x-y|\leq 2r_{n,n}}} E\left(Y(n,y)\right) \tag{3.25}$$

$$\leq C_6\sum_{x\,;\,|x|\leq 2r_{n,n}} K_n^2Q_n\leq C_7\,e^{2n}K_n^2Q_n\leq C_8\left\{E\left(\sum_{x\in U_n}Y(n,x)\right)\right\}^2$$

using (3.24) and (3.16). This completes the proof of (3.19) and hence of (3.1).

□

4. First moment estimates

By (2.12), (2.5) and (2.6) we have that for any $x\in D(0,n)$

$$\begin{aligned}P^x\left(T_0<T_{D(0,n)^c}\right) &= \frac{(2/\pi)\log(n/|x|)+O(|x|^{-1})}{(2/\pi)\log n+\gamma+O(n^{-1})}\\ &= \frac{\log(n/|x|)+O(|x|^{-1})}{\log(n)}(1+O((\log n)^{-1}).\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

By Exercise 1.6.8 of [4] we have that uniformly in $r<|x|<R$

$$P^x\left(T_{D(0,R)^c}<T_{D(0,r)}\right)=\frac{\log(|x|/r)+O(r^{-1})}{\log(R/r)}\tag{4.2}$$

and

$$P^x\left(T_{D(0,r)}<T_{D(0,R)^c}\right)=\frac{\log(R/|x|)+O(r^{-1})}{\log(R/r)}.\tag{4.3}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2: For $x\in U_n$ we begin by getting bounds on the probability of reaching $\partial D(x,r_{n,0})$ before $T_{\partial D(0,K_n)}$. Since

$$P\left(T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,0})}<T_{\partial D(0,K_n)}\right)\geq P\left(T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,0})}<T_{\partial D(x,\frac{1}{2}K_n)}\right)\tag{4.4}$$

we see from (4.3) that uniformly in n and $x\in U_n$

$$P\left(T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,0})}<T_{\partial D(0,K_n)}\right)\geq c\tag{4.5}$$

for some $c>0$. And since for $x\in U_n$ and $y\in\partial D(x,r_{n,0})$

$$\begin{aligned}&P^y\left(T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,1})}<T_{\partial D(x,\frac{1}{2}K_n)}\right)\\ &\quad\leq P^y\left(T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,1})}<T_{\partial D(0,K_n)}\right)\\ &\qquad\leq P^y\left(T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,1})}<T_{\partial D(x,2K_n)}\right)\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

we see from (4.3) that uniformly in n, $x\in U_n$ and $y\in\partial D(x,r_{n,0})$

$$c/\log n\leq P^y\left(T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,1})}<T_{\partial D(0,K_n)}\right)\leq c'/\log n.\tag{4.7}$$

Similarly, since for $x\in U_n$ and $y\in\partial D(x,r_{n,0})$

$$P^y\left(T_{\partial D(0,K_n)}<T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,1})}\right)\geq P^y\left(T_{\partial D(x,2K_n)}<T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,1})}\right)\tag{4.8}$$

we see from (4.2) that uniformly in n, $x \in U_n$ and $y \in \partial D(x, r_{n,0})$

$$P^y\left(T_{\partial D(0,K_n)} < T_{\partial D(x,r_{n,1})}\right) \geq c > 0. \tag{4.9}$$

These bounds will be used for excursions at the 'top' levels. To bound excursions at 'intermediate' levels we note that using (4.2), we have uniformly for $x \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$, with $1 \leq l \leq n-1$

$$P^x\left(T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l-1})} < T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l+1})}\right) = 1/2 + O(n^{-8}) \tag{4.10}$$

and consequently also

$$P^x\left(T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l+1})} < T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l-1})}\right) = 1/2 + O(n^{-8}). \tag{4.11}$$

Let $\bar{m} = (m_2, m_3, \ldots, m_n)$ and set $|\bar{m}| = 2\sum_{j=2}^n m_j + 1$. Let $\mathcal{H}_n(\bar{m})$, be the collection of maps, ('histories'),

$$\varphi : \{0, 1, \ldots, |\bar{m}|\} \mapsto \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$$

such that $\varphi(0) = 1$, $\varphi(j+1) = \varphi(j) \pm 1$, $|\bar{m}| = \inf\{j\,;\, \varphi(j) = 0\}$ and the number of upcrossings from $\ell - 1$ to ℓ

$$u(\ell) =: |\{(j, j+1) \,|\, (\varphi(j), \varphi(j+1)) = (\ell - 1, \ell)\}|.$$

The number of ways to partition the $u(\ell+1)$ upcrossings from ℓ to $\ell+1$ among and after the $u(\ell)$ upcrossings from $\ell - 1$ to ℓ is

$$\binom{u(\ell+1) + u(\ell) - 1}{u(\ell) - 1}. \tag{4.12}$$

Since $u(\ell) = m_\ell$ and the mapping φ is completely determined once we know the relative order of all its upcrossings

$$|\mathcal{H}_n(\bar{m})| = \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \binom{m_{\ell+1} + m_\ell - 1}{m_\ell - 1}. \tag{4.13}$$

To each random walk path we assign a 'history' $h(\omega)$ as follows. Let $\tau(0)$ be the time of the first visit to $\partial D(x, r_{n,1})$, and define $\tau(1), \tau(2), \ldots$ to be the successive hitting times of different elements of

$$\{\partial D(x, r_{n,0}), \ldots, \partial D(x, r_{n,n})\}$$

until the first downcrossing from $\partial D(x, r_{n,1})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,0})$. Setting $\Phi(y) = k$ if $y \in \partial D(x, r_{n,k})$, let $h(\omega)(j) = \Phi(\omega(\tau(j)))$. Let $h_{|_k}$ be the restriction of h to $\{0, \ldots, k\}$. We claim that uniformly for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_n(\bar{m})$ and $z \in \partial D(x, r_{n,1})$

$$P^z\left\{h_{|_{|\bar{m}|}} = \varphi\right\} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{|\bar{m}| - m_n} \left\{1 + O(n^{-8})\right\}^{|\bar{m}| - m_n}. \tag{4.14}$$

To see this, simply use the Markov property successively at the times

$$\tau(0), \tau(1), \ldots, \tau(|\bar{m}| - 1)$$

and then use (4.10), (4.11). (The m_n downcrossings from n to $n-1$ come 'for free').

Writing $m \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k$ if $m = 1$ for $k < k_0$ and $|m - \mathfrak{n}_k| \leq k$ for $k \geq k_0$ we see that uniformly in $m_n \overset{n}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_n$ we have that $\left\{1 + O(n^{-8})\right\}^{|\bar{m}|} = 1 + O(n^{-4})$. Combining this with (4.13) and (4.14) we see that uniformly in $z \in \partial D(x, r_{n,1})$

$$\sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n \\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}} P^z\left\{h_{|_{|\bar{m}|}} \in \mathcal{H}_n(\bar{m})\right\} \tag{4.15}$$

$$= (1 + O(n^{-4})) \sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n \\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{|\bar{m}| - m_n} \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \binom{m_{\ell+1} + m_\ell - 1}{m_\ell - 1}$$

$$= (1 + O(n^{-4})) \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n \\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}} \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \binom{m_{\ell+1} + m_\ell - 1}{m_\ell - 1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{\ell+1} + m_\ell} .$$

Here we used the fact that $m_2 = 1$ so that $|\bar{m}| - m_n = 2 + \sum_{\ell=2}^{n-1}(m_{\ell+1} + m_\ell)$.

Lemma 4.1. *For some $C = C(a) < \infty$ and all $k \geq 2$, $|m - \mathfrak{n}_{k+1}| \leq k + 1$, $|\ell + 1 - \mathfrak{n}_k| \leq k$,*

$$\frac{C^{-1} k^{-3a-1}}{\sqrt{\log k}} \leq \binom{m + \ell}{\ell} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m + \ell + 1} \leq \frac{C k^{-3a-1}}{\sqrt{\log k}}. \tag{4.16}$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1: It suffices to consider $k \gg 1$ in which case the binomial coefficient in (4.16) is well approximated by Stirling's formula

$$m! = \sqrt{2\pi} m^m e^{-m} \sqrt{m}(1 + o(1)) .$$

With $\mathfrak{n}_k = 3ak^2 \log k$ it follows that for some $C_1 < \infty$ and all k large enough, if $|m - \mathfrak{n}_{k+1}| \leq 2k$, $|\ell - \mathfrak{n}_k| \leq 2k$ then

$$|\frac{m}{\ell} - 1 - \frac{2}{k}| \leq \frac{C_1}{k \log k} . \tag{4.17}$$

Hereafter, we use the notation $f \sim g$ if f/g is bounded and bounded away from zero as $k \to \infty$, uniformly in $\{m : |m - \mathfrak{n}_{k+1}| \leq 2k\}$ and $\{\ell : |\ell - \mathfrak{n}_k| \leq 2k\}$. We then have by the preceeding observations that

$$\binom{m + \ell}{\ell} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m + \ell + 1} \sim \frac{(m + \ell)^{m + \ell}}{\sqrt{\ell}\, \ell^\ell m^m} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m + \ell} \sim \frac{\exp(-\ell I(\frac{m}{\ell}))}{\sqrt{k^2 \log k}} , \tag{4.18}$$

where

$$I(\lambda) = -(1 + \lambda) \log(1 + \lambda) + \lambda \log \lambda + \lambda \log 2 + \log 2 .$$

The function $I(\lambda)$ and its first order derivative vanishes at 1, with the second derivative $I_{\lambda\lambda}(1) = 1/2$. Thus, by a Taylor expansion to second order of $I(\lambda)$ at 1, the estimate (4.17) results with

$$|I(\frac{m}{\ell}) - \frac{1}{k^2}| \leq \frac{C_2}{k^2 \log k} \tag{4.19}$$

for some $C_2 < \infty$, all k large enough and m, ℓ in the range considered here. Since $|\ell - 3ak^2 \log k| \leq 2k$, combining (4.18) and (4.19) we establish (4.16).

$\square$

Using the last Lemma we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n \\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}} \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \frac{C^{-1}\ell^{-3a-1}}{\sqrt{\log \ell}} \\ &\qquad \leq \sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n \\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}} \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \binom{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell-1}{m_\ell-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell} \\ &\qquad\qquad \leq \sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n \\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}} \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \frac{C\ell^{-3a-1}}{\sqrt{\log \ell}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Using the fact that $|\{m_\ell \,|\, m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell\}| = 2\ell + 1$, this shows that for some $C_1 < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} &n \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \frac{C_1^{-1}\ell^{-3a}}{\sqrt{\log \ell}} \\ &\qquad \leq \sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n \\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}} \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \binom{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell-1}{m_\ell-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell} \\ &\qquad\qquad \leq n \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \frac{C_1\ell^{-3a}}{\sqrt{\log \ell}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

Since for any $c < \infty$, for some $\zeta_n, \zeta'_n \to 0$

$$nc^n \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \log \ell = n^{n\zeta_n} = (n!)^{\zeta'_n} \tag{4.22}$$

we see that for some $\delta_{1,n}, \delta_{2,n} \to 0$

$$\sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n \\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}} \prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1} \binom{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell-1}{m_\ell-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell} = (n!)^{-3a-\delta_{1,n}} = r_{n,0}^{-a-\delta_{2,n}}. \tag{4.23}$$

(4.5)-(4.9) and (4.15) show that for some $0 < c, c' < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{c}{\log n}\sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n\\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}}\prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1}\binom{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell-1}{m_\ell-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell}& \\ \leq Q_n = \inf_{x\in U_n} P(x \text{ is } n\text{-successful})& \\ \leq \frac{c'}{\log n}\sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n\\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}}\prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1}\binom{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell-1}{m_\ell-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell}&.\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

Together with (4.23) this gives (3.20) and (3.21).

Let $N^x_{n,i,m,k}$ denote the number of excursions from $\partial D(x, r_{n,k-1})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,k})$ until completion of the first m excursions from $\partial D(x, r_{n,i})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,i-1})$. We note here for later reference that the analysis of this section shows that uniformly in $m_k \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k,\ k = l, l+1, \ldots, n$ and $z \in \partial D(x, r_{n,l})$

$$\begin{aligned}&P^z\left(N^x_{n,l,m_l,k} = m_k,\ k = l+1,\ldots,n\right)\\ &= (1+O(n^{-4}))\prod_{k=l}^{n-1}\binom{m_{k+1}+m_k-1}{m_k-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{k+1}+m_k}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

Our analysis also shows that for some $\delta_{3,l} \to 0$

$$\inf_{\substack{m_l\\ m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l}}\left(\sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_{l-1}\\ m_k \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k}}\prod_{k=2}^{l-1}\binom{m_{k+1}+m_k-1}{m_k-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{k+1}+m_k}\right) \geq ((l-1)!)^{-3a-\delta_{3,l}}, \tag{4.26}$$

and since

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_n\\ m_\ell \overset{\ell}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_\ell}}\prod_{\ell=2}^{n-1}\binom{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell-1}{m_\ell-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{\ell+1}+m_\ell}\\ &\geq \sum_{\substack{m_l,\ldots,m_n\\ m_k \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k}}\prod_{k=l}^{n-1}\binom{m_{k+1}+m_k-1}{m_k-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{k+1}+m_k}\\ &\quad\inf_{\substack{m_l\\ m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l}}\left(\sum_{\substack{m_2,\ldots,m_{l-1}\\ m_k \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k}}\prod_{k=2}^{l-1}\binom{m_{k+1}+m_k-1}{m_k-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{k+1}+m_k}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

(here we used the bound that for $C(i,j), D(i,j)$ non-negative, $\sum_{i,j,k} C(i,j)D(j,k) = \sum_j \sum_i C(i,j) \sum_k D(j,k) \geq \left(\sum_{i,j} C(i,j)\right) \inf_j \sum_k D(j,k)$), we see from (4.25) and (4.24) that uniformly in $z \in \partial D(x, r_{n,l})$

$$\sum_{\substack{m_l,\ldots,m_n \\ m_k \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k}} P^z\left(N^x_{n,l,m_l,k} = m_k,\ k = l+1,\ldots,n\right) \leq C \log n\, Q_n\ (l!)^{3a+\delta_{3,l}}. \tag{4.28}$$

Thus from (4.7) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{m_l,\ldots,m_n \\ m_k \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k}} P\left(N^x_{n,l,m_l,k} = m_k,\ k = l+1,\ldots,n\right) \leq C\, Q_n\ (l!)^{3a+\delta_{3,l}}. \tag{4.29}$$

Similarly, uniformly in $m_k \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k,\ k = 2, 3, \ldots, l$ and $z \in \partial D(x, r_{n,1})$

$$\begin{aligned} P^z\left(N^x_{n,1,1,k} = m_k,\ k = 2,\ldots,l\right) \\ = (1 + O(n^{-4})) \prod_{k=2}^{l-1} \binom{m_{k+1} + m_k - 1}{m_k - 1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{k+1}+m_k}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

5. Second moment estimates

We begin by defining the σ-algebra $\mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}$ of excursions from $\partial D(x, r_{n,l-1})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,l})$. To this end, fix $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, let $\overline{\tau}_0 = 0$ and for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i &= \inf\{t \geq \overline{\tau}_{i-1} :\ X_t \in \partial D(x, r_{n,l})\}, \\ \overline{\tau}_i &= \inf\{t \geq \tau_i :\ X_t \in \partial D(x, r_{n,l-1})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}$ is the σ-algebra generated by the excursions $\{e^{(j)}, j = 1, \ldots\}$, where $e^{(j)} = \{X_t : \overline{\tau}_{j-1} \leq t \leq \tau_j\}$ is the j-th excursion from $\partial D(x, r_{n,l-1})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,l})$ (so for $j = 1$ we do begin at $t = 0$).

The following Lemma is proven in the next section. Note that for any σ-algebra $\mathcal{G}$ and event $B \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $P(A, B \,|\, \mathcal{G}) = P(A \,|\, \mathcal{G}) 1_{\{B\}}$.

Lemma 5.1 (Decoupling Lemma). *Let* $\Gamma^y_{n,l} = \{N^y_{n,i} = m_i; i = l+1, l+2, \ldots, n\}$. *Then, uniformly over all* $l \leq n$, $m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l$, $\{m_i : i = l+1, l+2, \ldots, n\}$, $y \in U_n$ *and* $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus D(y, r_{n,l})$,

$$\begin{aligned} P^{x_0}(\Gamma^y_{n,l}\,,\ N^y_{n,l} = m_l \,|\, \mathcal{G}^y_{n,l}) \\ = (1 + O(n^{-1} \log n)) P^{x_1}(\Gamma^y_{n,l} \,|\, N^y_{n,l} = m_l) 1_{\{N^y_{n,l} = m_l\}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Remark 1. The intuition behind the Decoupling Lemma is that what happens 'deep inside' $D(y, r_{n,l})$, e.g. $\Gamma^y_{n,l}$, is 'almost' independent of what happens outside $D(y, r_{n,l})$, i.e. $\mathcal{G}^y_{n,l}$.

Proof of (3.22): Recall that $\mathfrak{n}_k = 3ak^2 \log k$ and that we write $m \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k$ if $m = 1$ for $k < k_0$ and $|m - \mathfrak{n}_k| \leq k$ for $k \geq k_0$. Relying upon the first moment estimates and Lemma 5.1, we next prove the second moment estimates (3.22). Take $x, y \in U_n$ with $l(x, y) = l - 1$. Thus $2r_{n,l-1} + 2 \leq |x - y| < 2r_{n,l-2} + 2$ for some $2 \leq l \leq n$. Since $r_{n,l-3} - r_{n,l-2} \gg 2r_{n,l-1}$, it is easy to see that $D(y, r_{n,l-1}) \cap \partial D(x, r_{n,k}) = \emptyset$ for all $k \neq l-2$. Replacing hereafter l by $l \wedge (n-3)$, it follows that for $k \neq l-1, l-2$, the events $\{N^x_{n,k} \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k\}$ are measurable on the σ-algebra $\mathcal{G}^y_{n,l}$. With $J_l := \{l+1, \ldots, n\}$ and $I_l := \{2, \ldots, l-3, l, \ldots, n\}$, set $\widetilde{\Gamma}^y_n(J_l) = \{N^y_{n,k} \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k,\ k \in J_l\}$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(I_l) = \{N^x_{n,k} \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k,\ k \in I_l\}$. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{x, y \text{ are } n\text{-successful}\} \\ &\qquad \subseteq \bigcup_{m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l} \widetilde{\Gamma}^y_n(J_l) \cap \{N^y_{n,l} = m_l\} \cap \widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(I_l). \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Applying (5.1), we have that for some universal constant $C_3 < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P\,(x \text{ and } y \text{ are } n\text{-successful}) \\ &\le \sum_{m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l} P\left[\widetilde{\Gamma}^y_n(J_l), \{N^y_{n,l} = m_l\}, \widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(I_l)\right] \\ &= \sum_{m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l} E\left[P(\widetilde{\Gamma}^y_n(J_l),\ N^y_{n,l} = m_l \,\big|\, \mathcal{G}^y_{n,l})\,; \widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(I_l)\right] \\ &\le C_3 P(\widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(I_l)) \sum_{m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l} P(\widetilde{\Gamma}^y_n(J_l) \,\big|\, N^y_{n,l} = m_l) \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Using the Markov property and (4.29), for some universal constant $C_5 < \infty$,

$$\sum_{m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l} P(\widetilde{\Gamma}^y_n(J_l) \,\big|\, N^y_{n,l} = m_l) \le C_5 Q_n\ (l!)^{3a+\delta_{3,l}}. \tag{5.4}$$

Similarly, with $M_{l-3} := \{2, \ldots, l-3\}$, and

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(M_{l-3}) = \{N^x_{n,k} \overset{k}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_k,\ k \in M_{l-3}\},$$

(5.1) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(I_l)\right) &\le \sum_{m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l} E\left[P(\widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(J_l),\ N^x_{n,l} = m_l \,|\mathcal{G}^x_{n,l})\,; \widetilde{\Gamma}^x(M_{l-3})\right] \\ &\le C_6 P\left(\widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(M_{l-3})\right) \sum_{m_l \overset{l}{\sim} \mathfrak{n}_l} P(\widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(J_l) \,\big|\, N^x_{n,l} = m_l). \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Using (4.15), (4.23) and (5.4) we get that, for some $\delta_{4,l} \to 0$

$$P\left(\widetilde{\Gamma}^x_n(I_l)\right) \le C_7 l^{15}\, (l!)^{\delta_{4,l}}\, Q_n. \tag{5.6}$$

Putting (5.3), (5.4) and (5.6) together and adjusting C and δ'_{l-1} proves (3.22) for $l(x, y) = l-1$.
□

6. HARNACK INEQUALITIES AND APPROXIMATE DECOUPLING

The goal of this section is to prove the Decoupling Lemma, Lemma 5.1. Since what happens 'deep inside' $D(y, r_{n,l})$, e.g. $\Gamma^{y}_{n,l}$, depends on what happens outside $D(y, r_{n,l})$, i.e. on $\mathcal{G}^{y}_{n,l}$, only through the initial and end points of the excursions from $\partial D(x, r_{n,l})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,l-1})$, we begin by studying the dependence on these initial and end points. The following Harnack inequality plays a crucial role in this analysis.

Define the hitting distribution of A by

$$H_A(x,y) = P^x(X_{T_A} = y). \tag{6.1}$$

Lemma 6.1. *Uniformly for* $x, x' \in D(0, \varepsilon n)$, $\varepsilon < 1/4$ *and* $y \in D(0,n)^c$

$$H_{D(0,n)^c}(x,y) = (1 + O(\varepsilon))\, H_{D(0,n)^c}(x',y). \tag{6.2}$$

Furthermore, if $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ *are such that*

$$\inf_{x \in \partial D(0,\varepsilon n)} P^x(T_{D(0,n)^c} < T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}) \geq 1/4,$$

then uniformly in $x \in \partial D(0, \varepsilon n)$ *and* $y \in D(0,n)^c$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P^x(X_{T_{D(0,n)^c}} = y\,,\, T_{D(0,n)^c} < T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}) \\ &= (1 + O(\varepsilon))\, P^x(T_{D(0,n)^c} < T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}) H_{D(0,n)^c}(x,y). \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Proof of Lemma 6.1: (6.2) is formula (2.7) of [4].

Turning to (6.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P^x(X_{T_{D(0,n)^c}} = y\,,\, T_{D(0,n)^c} < T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}) \\ &= H_{D(0,n)^c}(x,y) - P^x(X_{T_{D(0,n)^c}} = y\,,\, T_{D(0,n)^c} > T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}). \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

By the strong Markov property at $T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}$

$$\begin{aligned} &P^x(X_{T_{D(0,n)^c}} = y\,,\, T_{D(0,n)^c} > T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}) \\ &= E^x(H_{D(0,n)^c}(X_{T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}}, y);\, T_{D(0,n)^c} > T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}). \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

By (6.2), uniformly in $w \in \partial D(0, \varepsilon' n)$,

$$H_{D(0,n)^c}(w,y) = (1 + O(\varepsilon))\, H_{D(0,n)^c}(x,y))\,.$$

Substituting back into (6.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P^x(X_{T_{D(0,n)^c}} = y\,,\, T_{D(0,n)^c} > T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}) \\ &= (1 + O(\varepsilon))\, P^x(T_{D(0,n)^c} > T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}) H_{D(0,n)^c}(x,y). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (6.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &P^x(X_{T_{D(0,n)^c}} = y\,,\, T_{D(0,n)^c} < T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}) \\ &= \big(P^x(T_{D(0,n)^c} < T_{\partial D(0,\varepsilon' n)}) + O(\varepsilon)\big)\, H_{D(0,n)^c}(x,y). \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Using the assumptions of the lemma we obtain (6.3) which completes the proof of Lemma 6.1.

□

Consider a random path beginning at $z \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$. We will show that for n large, a certain σ-algebra of excursions of the path from $\partial D(0, r_{n,l+1})$ to $\partial D(0, r_{n,l})$ prior to $T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l-1})}$, is almost independent of the choice of initial point $z \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$ and final point $w \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l-1})$. Let $\tau_0 = 0$ and for $i = 0, 1, \ldots$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{2i+1} &= \inf\{t \geq \tau_{2i} : \ X_t \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l+1}) \cup \partial D(0, r_{n,l-1})\} \\ \tau_{2i+2} &= \inf\{t \geq \tau_{2i+1} : \ X_t \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})\}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Abbreviating $\bar{\tau} = T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l-1})}$ note that $\bar{\tau} = \tau_{2I+1}$ for some (unique) non-negative integer I. As usual, $\mathcal{F}_j$ will denote the $\sigma-$algebra generated by $\{X_l,\ l = 0, 1, \ldots, j\}$, and for any stopping time τ, $\mathcal{F}_\tau$ will denote the collection of events A such that $A \cap \{\tau = j\} \in \mathcal{F}_j$ for all j.

Let $\mathcal{H}_{n,l}$ denote the σ-algebra generated by the excursions of the path from $\partial D(0, r_{n,l+1})$ to $\partial D(0, r_{n,l})$, prior to $T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l-1})}$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{n,l}$ is the σ-algebra generated by the excursions $\{v^{(j)}, j = 1, \ldots, I\}$, where $v^{(j)} = \{X_t : \tau_{2j-1} \leq t \leq \tau_{2j}\}$ is the j-th excursion from $\partial D(0, r_{n,l+1})$ to $\partial D(0, r_{n,l})$. We denote by $\mathcal{U}(\{\mathcal{H}_{n,l}\})$ the collection of sequences of sets $\{B_n\,; n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$, $B_n \in \mathcal{H}_{n,l}$ such that uniformly in $x, x' \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l+1})$

$$P^x(B_n) = (1 + O(n^{-4}))P^{x'}(B_n)\,. \tag{6.7}$$

Lemma 6.2. *For a random walk path starting at $z \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$, let $\mathcal{H}_{n,l}$ denote the σ-algebra generated by the excursions of the path from $\partial D(0, r_{n,l+1})$ to $\partial D(0, r_{n,l})$, prior to $T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l-1})}$. Then, uniformly in n, $z \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$, $w \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l-1})$, and $B_n \in \mathcal{H}_{n,l}$,*

$$P^z(B_n \,\big|\, X_{T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l-1})}} = w) = (1 + O(n^{-3}))P^z(B_n). \tag{6.8}$$

Furthermore, uniformly in n, $z, z' \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$, and sequences $B_n \in \mathcal{U}(\{\mathcal{H}_{n,l}\})$

$$P^z(B_n) = (1 + O(n^{-3}))P^{z'}(B_n)\,. \tag{6.9}$$

When we say that a statement such as (6.9) is uniform in sequences $B_n \in \mathcal{U}(\{\mathcal{H}_{n,l}\})$, we mean that there exists a $0 < d < \infty$ such that if uniformly in $x, x' \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l+1})$

$$(1 - cn^{-4})P^{x'}(B_n) \leq P^x(B_n) \leq (1 + cn^{-4})P^{x'}(B_n)\,. \tag{6.10}$$

then uniformly in $z, z' \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$

$$(1 - dcn^{-3})P^{z'}(B_n) \leq P^z(B_n) \leq (1 + dcn^{-3})P^{z'}(B_n)\,. \tag{6.11}$$

Proof of Lemma 6.2: Fixing $z \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$ it suffices to consider $B_n \in \mathcal{H}_{n,l}$ for which $P^z(B_n) > 0$. Fix such a set B_n and a point $w \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l-1})$. Using the notation introduced right before the statement of our Lemma, for any $i \geq 1$, we can write

$$\{B_n, I = i\} = \{B_{n,i}, \tau_{2i} < \bar{\tau}\} \cap (\{I = 0\} \circ \theta_{\tau_{2i}})$$

for some $B_{n,i} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tau_{2i}} = \{A \,|\, A\cap\}$, so by the strong Markov property at τ_{2i},

$$P^z[X_{\bar\tau} = w; B_n, I = i] = E^z\left[P^{X_{\tau_{2i}}}(X_{\bar\tau} = w,\ I = 0); B_{n,i}, \tau_{2i} < \bar\tau\right] ,$$

and

$$P^z\left(B_n, I = i\right) = E^z\left[P^{X_{\tau_{2i}}}(I = 0)\,; B_{n,i}, \tau_{2i} < \bar\tau\right] .$$

Consequently, for all $i \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P^z[X_{\bar\tau} = w; B_n, I = i] \\ &\geq P^z\left(B_n, I = i\right) \inf_{x\in\partial D(0,r_{n,l})} \frac{P^x\left(X_{\bar\tau} = w;\ I = 0\right)}{P^x\left(I = 0\right)} . \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

Necessarily $P^z(B_n\,|I = 0) \in \{0,1\}$ and is independent of z for any $B_n \in \mathcal{H}_{n,l}$, implying that (6.12) applies for $i = 0$ as well. By (6.3), (6.2) and (4.2) there exists $c < \infty$ such that for any $z, x \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$ and $w \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l-1})$,

$$\frac{P^x\left(X_{\bar\tau} = w;\ I = 0\right)}{E^x\left(I = 0\right)} \geq (1 - cn^{-3})H_{D(0,r_{n,l-1})^c}(z, w) .$$

Hence, summing (6.12) over $I = 0, 1, \dots$, we get that

$$P^z\left[X_{\bar\tau} = w, B_n\right] \geq (1 - cn^{-3})P^z(B_n)H_{D(0,r_{n,l-1})^c}(z, w) .$$

A similar argument shows that

$$P^z\left[X_{\bar\tau} = w, B_n\right] \leq (1 + cn^{-3})P^z\left(B_n\right)H_{D(0,r_{n,l-1})^c}(z, w) ,$$

and we thus obtain (6.8).

By the Markov property at τ_1, for any $z \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$,

$$\begin{aligned} P^z(B_n) = P^z(B_n, I = 0)& \\ &+ \sum_{x\in\partial D(0,r_{n,l+1})} H_{D(0,r_{n,l+1})\cup D(0,r_{n,l-1})^c}(z, x)P^x\left(B_n\right) . \end{aligned}$$

The term involving $\{B_n, I = 0\}$ is dealt with by (4.10) and by (6.7). For any fixed $x_0 \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l+1})$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{x\in\partial D(0,r_{n,l+1})} H_{D(0,r_{n,l+1})\cup D(0,r_{n,l-1})^c}(z, x)P^x\left(B_n\right) \\ &= (1 + O(n^{-4}))P^{x_0}\left(B_n\right) \sum_{x\in\partial D(0,r_{n,l+1})} H_{D(0,r_{n,l+1})\cup D(0,r_{n,l-1})^c}(z, x) \\ &= (1 + O(n^{-4}))P^{x_0}\left(B_n\right)P^z(T_{D(0,r_{n,l+1})} < T_{D(0,r_{n,l-1})^c}) \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

so that (6.9) follows by (4.11).

□

Building upon Lemma 6.2 we quantify the independence between the σ-algebra $\mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}$ of excursions from $\partial D(x, r_{n,l-1})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,l})$ introduced in the previous section and the σ-algebra $\mathcal{H}^x_{n,l}(m)$ of excursions from $\partial D(x, r_{n,l+1})$

to $\partial D(x, r_{n,l})$ during the first m excursions from $\partial D(x, r_{n,l})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,l-1})$. To this end, fix $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, let $\overline{\tau}_0 = 0$ and for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i &= \inf\{t \geq \overline{\tau}_{i-1} : \; X_t \in \partial D(x, r_{n,l})\}\,, \\ \overline{\tau}_i &= \inf\{t \geq \tau_i : \; X_t \in \partial D(x, r_{n,l-1})\} \end{aligned}$$

and that $\mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}$ is the σ-algebra generated by the excursions $\{e^{(j)}, j = 1, \ldots\}$, where $e^{(j)} = \{X_t : \overline{\tau}_{j-1} \leq t \leq \tau_j\}$ is the j-th excursion from $\partial D(x, r_{n,l-1})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,l})$ (so for $j = 1$ we do begin at $t = 0$).

We denote by $\mathcal{H}^x_{n,l}(m)$ the σ-algebra generated by all excursions from $\partial D(x, r_{n,l+1})$ to $\partial D(x, r_{n,l})$ from time τ_1 until time $\overline{\tau}_m$. In more detail, for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ let $\overline{\zeta}_{j,0} = \tau_j$ and for $i = 1, \ldots$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{j,i} &= \inf\{t \geq \overline{\zeta}_{j,i-1} : \; X_t \in \partial D(x, r_{n,l+1})\}\,, \\ \overline{\zeta}_{j,i} &= \inf\{t \geq \zeta_{j,i} : \; X_t \in \partial D(x, r_{n,l})\}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Let $v_{j,i} = \{X_t : \zeta_{j,i} \leq t \leq \overline{\zeta}_{j,i}\}$ and $Z^j = \sup\{i \geq 0 : \overline{\zeta}_{j,i} < \overline{\tau}_j\}$. Then, $\mathcal{H}^x_{n,l}(m)$ is the product σ-algebra generated by the σ-algebras $\mathcal{H}^x_{n,l,j} = \sigma(v_{j,i}, i = 1, \ldots, Z^j)$ of the excursions between times τ_j and $\overline{\tau}_j$, for $j = 1, \ldots, m$.

We denote by $\mathcal{U}(\{\mathcal{H}^x_{n,l}(m)\})$ the collection of sequences of sets $H_n \in \mathcal{H}^x_{n,l}(m)$ of the form $H_n = H_{n,1} \cap H_{n,2} \cap \cdots \cap H_{n,m}$, with $H_{n,j} \in \mathcal{U}(\{\mathcal{H}^x_{n,l,j}\})$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$.

Lemma 6.3. *Uniformly over all $l \leq n$, $m \leq (n \log n)^2$, $x, y_0, y_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $H_n \in \mathcal{U}(\{\mathcal{H}^x_{n,l}(m)\})$,*

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - O(mn^{-3}))P^{y_1}(H_n) &\leq P^{y_0}(H_n \,|\, \mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}) \\ &\leq (1 + O(mn^{-3}))P^{y_1}(H_n)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

Proof of Lemma 6.3: We can write $H_n = H_{n,1} \cap H_{n,2} \cap \cdots \cap H_{n,m}$, with $H_{n,j} \in \mathcal{U}(\{\mathcal{H}^x_{n,l,j}\})$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Conditioned upon $\mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}$ the events $H_{n,j}$ are independent. Further, each $H_{n,j}$ then has the conditional law of an event $B_{n,j}$ in the collection $\mathcal{U}(\{\mathcal{H}_{n,l}\})$ of Lemma 6.2, for some random $z_j = X_{\tau_j} - x \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})$ and $w_j = X_{\overline{\tau}_j} - x \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l-1})$, both measurable on $\mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}$. By our conditions, the uniform estimates (6.8) and (6.9) yield that for any fixed $z' \in \partial D(0, r_{n,l})_s$,

$$\begin{aligned} P^{y_0}(H_n \,|\, \mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}) &= P^{y_0}(\cap_{j=1}^m (H_{n,j}) \,|\, \mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^m P^{z_j}(B_{n,j} \,|\, X_{T_{\partial D(0,r_{n,l})^c}} = w_j) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^m (1 + O(n^{-3}))P^{z_j}(B_{n,j}) \\ &= (1 + O(n^{-3}))^m \prod_{j=1}^m P^{z'}(B_{n,j})\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

Since $m \leq (n \log n)^2$ and the right-hand side of (6.15) neither depends on $y_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ nor on the extra information in $\mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}$, we get (6.14) by averaging over $\mathcal{G}^x_{n,l}$.
□

Proof of Lemma 5.1: For $j = 1, 2, \dots$ and $i = l+1, l+2, \dots, n$, let Z_i^j denote the number of excursions from $\partial D(y, r_{n,i-1})$ to $\partial D(y, r_{n,i})$ by the random walk during the time interval $[\tau_j, \overline{\tau}_j]$. Using (4.25), the event

$$H_n = \{\sum_{j=1}^{m_l} Z_i^j = m_i : i = l+1, l+2, \dots, n\}$$

can be written as a disjoint union of events in the collection $\mathcal{U}(\{\mathcal{H}^y_{n,l}(m_l)\})$ of Lemma 6.3. It is easy to verify that starting at any $x \notin D(y, r_{n,l})$, when the event $\{N^y_{n,l} = m_l\} \in \mathcal{G}^y_{n,l}$ occurs, it implies that $N^y_{n,i} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_l} Z_i^j$ for $i = l+1, l+2, \dots, n$. Thus,

$$P^{x_0}(\Gamma^y_{n,l} \,|\mathcal{G}^y_{n,l})\mathbf{1}_{\{N^y_{n,l}=m_l\}} = P^{x_0}(H_n \,|\mathcal{G}^y_{n,l})\mathbf{1}_{\{N^y_{n,l}=m_l\}} . \tag{6.16}$$

With $m_l/(n^2 \log n)$ bounded above, by (6.14) we have, uniformly in $y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus D(y, r_{n,l})$,

$$P^{x_0}(H_n \,|\mathcal{G}^y_{n,l}) = (1 + O(n^{-1} \log n))P^{x_1}(H_n) . \tag{6.17}$$

Hence,

$$P^{x_0}(\Gamma^y_{n,l} \,|\mathcal{G}^y_{n,l})\mathbf{1}_{\{N^y_{n,l}=m_l\}} = (1 + O(n^{-1} \log n))P^{x_1}(H_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{N^y_{n,l}=m_l\}} . \tag{6.18}$$

Taking $x_0 = x_1$ and averaging, one has

$$P^{x_1}(\Gamma^y_{n,l} \,|N^y_{n,l} = m_l) = (1 + O(n^{-1} \log n))P^{x_1}(H_n) \tag{6.19}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & P^{x_1}(\Gamma^y_{n,l} \,|N^y_{n,l} = m_l)\mathbf{1}_{\{N^y_{n,l}=m_l\}} \\ &= (1 + O(n^{-1} \log n))P^{x_1}(H_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{N^y_{n,l}=m_l\}} \\ &= (1 + O(n^{-1} \log n))P^{x_0}(\Gamma^y_{n,l} \,|\mathcal{G}^y_{n,l})\mathbf{1}_{\{N^y_{n,l}=m_l\}} \end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

where we used (6.18) for the last equality. Using that $\{N^y_{n,l} = m_l\} \subset \mathcal{G}^y_{n,l}$, this is (5.1).
□

Acknowledgements I am grateful to Endre Csáki and Antónia Földes for many helpful comments.

References

1. A. Dembo, Y. Peres, J. Rosen and O. Zeitouni, *Thick points for planar Brownian motion and the Erdős-Taylor conjecture on random walk*, Acta Math. **186** (2001), 239–270.
2. A. Dembo, Y. Peres, J. Rosen and O. Zeitouni, *Late points for random walks in two dimensions*, Annals of Probability, to appear.

3. J.-P. Kahane, *Some random series of functions: Second Edition*, Cambridge University Press, (1985).
4. G. Lawler, *Intersections of random walks*. Birkhauser, (1991).
5. P. Révész, *Random Walk in Random and Non-Random Environments*, World Scientific, Singapore (1990).

Jay Rosen
Department of Mathematics
College of Staten Island, CUNY
Staten Island, NY 10314
jrosen3@earthlink.net